

1 JUDGE STEINBERG: It was Judge's Exhibit 2.

2 MR. PEDIGO: Judge's Exhibit 2?

3 MS. LANCASTER: Judge's Exhibit 4, I believe.

4 MR. PEDIGO: Judge's 4?

5 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

6 MR. PEDIGO: The February 27th letter.

7 JUDGE STEINBERG: Did I mark that?

8 MR. PEDIGO: I don't know. I never heard 4.

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: No, I didn't. I don't have any
10 record of marking it.

11 MS. LANCASTER: I've written it down. I thought
12 you did.

13 MR. ROMNEY: No.

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, I didn't.

15 MS. LANCASTER: No? Okay.

16 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Let me do that now.

17 We will identify as Judge's Exhibit 4 a letter
18 dated February 27, 2001 from Ms. Lancaster to Ms. Bolsover.

19 (The document referred to was
20 marked for identification as
21 Judge's Exhibit No. 4.)

22 BY MR. PEDIGO:

23 Q So it was the receipt of this February 27th letter
24 that brought to your attention this particular forensic
25 document examination problem referred to in paragraph 2 of

1 your March 5th letter. Is that correct?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q So you don't have any independent knowledge of
4 what the testimony was that may or may not have raised this
5 question?

6 A No.

7 Q And do you recall if it was in fact either Tuesday
8 or Wednesday when this document was finally ready to be
9 issued?

10 JUDGE STEINBERG: Judge's Exhibit 3.

11 MR. PEDIGO: Judge's Exhibit 3.

12 THE WITNESS: No, I can't recall.

13 BY MR. PEDIGO:

14 Q So when would this have been ready for use in this
15 hearing?

16 A Either Tuesday or Wednesday.

17 Q And what did you do to notify anyone related to
18 this hearing that this document was ready?

19 A I contacted Ms. Lancaster and told her that I was
20 finished with her request.

21 Q Okay. And that would have been either Tuesday or
22 Wednesday?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Did you have a conversation with her or did you
25 send her an e-mail, fax her the document? What was that

1 communication? What did it consist of?

2 JUDGE STEINBERG: Let me ask you, how is this
3 relevant? You're certainly not going to object to the
4 admission of these.

5 MR. PEDIGO: No, but I do think that if this
6 exculpatory information had been available Tuesday or
7 Wednesday, the exculpatory information should have been
8 available to us immediately.

9 MS. LANCASTER: How would it change anything,
10 Your Honor?

11 JUDGE STEINBERG: I can see how it would have
12 changed some of the cross-examination of some of the
13 witnesses that we had and perhaps --

14 MS. LANCASTER: Ask her when I got it. Ask her
15 when I got it.

16 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, okay. Continue.

17 MR. PEDIGO: All right.

18 BY MR. PEDIGO:

19 Q So as soon as this was ready, either Tuesday or
20 Wednesday, you notified the FCC. Is that correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q In that communication, did you notify them of the
23 essence of your opinion?

24 A No, I just said that the report was ready, that
25 I had everything and did she want me to send it back.

1 Q And what happened next?

2 A Then I went on to another case.

3 Q Well, were you requested to forward this report,
4 then?

5 A No, I was asked to bring it with me. At that
6 point, I was coming -- I was scheduled to testify, so I was
7 coming in the next day or two.

8 Q Well, in the past, you do have a fax number for
9 the FCC. Is that correct?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q So Tuesday or Wednesday, this report could have
12 been faxed to this building and the parties involved could
13 have had this report.

14 A Yes.

15 MR. PEDIGO: No further questions.

16 JUDGE STEINBERG: Do you want to move -- well,
17 it's a Judge's exhibit. I'll move on my own motion the
18 exhibits, Judge's Exhibits 3 and 4.

19 Any objection?

20 MR. ROMNEY: No, sir.

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: Judge's Exhibits 3 and 4 are
22 received.

23 (The documents referred to,
24 previously identified as
25 Judges's Exhibits No. 3 and 4,

1 were received in evidence.)

2 MS. LANCASTER: I believe there needs to be a
3 correction done to Judge's Exhibit 4, Your Honor, and I will
4 ask her about it.

5 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Sure.

6 Ms. Lancaster?

7 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MS. LANCASTER:

9 Q Ms. Bolsover, let's get that out of the way. If
10 you look at Judge's Exhibit 4, which is your report --

11 JUDGE STEINBERG: It's the February 27 --

12 MS. LANCASTER: It's the February 27th letter.

13 BY MS. LANCASTER:

14 Q I just want to make sure -- you see where an 8 was
15 written through and put a 9?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Was that supposed to be --

18 A It was supposed to be 16.

19 MS. LANCASTER: Okay.

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: So we can change the 9 -- on
21 page 1, where it says Q-9, we change that to Q-16?

22 THE WITNESS: The 8. Where the 8 is crossed out
23 and the 9 is above it?

24 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes.

25 THE WITNESS: That should be a 16, not a 9.

1 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

2 Has everybody got that?

3 (Pause.)

4 MS. LANCASTER: Are you ready, Your Honor?

5 JUDGE STEINBERG: Whenever you are.

6 MS. LANCASTER: Okay.

7 BY MS. LANCASTER:

8 Q Did you want information regarding whether or not
9 any -- what the testimony had been about any of these
10 documents?

11 A We prefer not to have that information.

12 Q Do you direct people not to tell you any
13 information about that?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Why?

16 A Because we don't want to be influenced in any way.
17 We are just asked to make a comparison and we make the
18 comparison.

19 Q So if someone were to tell you in advance what
20 that person expected the answer to be, do you think there is
21 a possibility it might influence how you looked at the
22 documents?

23 A It might influence it. I doubt that it would
24 change my opinion, if I thought the person did not do it,
25 even if they said they did. It wouldn't change my opinion.

1 Q This case was originally assigned to you, however,
2 after everything had already been sent out to the postal
3 lab. Is that correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q So you are unaware of any conversations or
6 instructions that I might have received regarding how much
7 information to convey. Is that correct? You didn't have
8 any conversations with me originally, did you?

9 A No. No.

10 Q When is the first time that you brought the report
11 to me? The latest report.

12 A This morning.

13 Q And do you remember originally you were scheduled
14 to testify on Thursday?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And do you remember our conversation occurred
17 Wednesday night or late Wednesday?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And so you were told just to bring it the next
20 day?

21 A Correct.

22 Q You've been testifying about what I call the
23 client copies, which are the copies in Exhibit 19, the
24 really bad copies of Jennifer Hill, Melissa Sumpter and
25 Norma Sumpter. Do you recall that testimony?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And you stated that those signatures appear to be
3 genuine signatures of those three people?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Are you able to tell from the copies how those
6 signatures got on those pages?

7 A No.

8 Q And I believe you stated that in your opinion one,
9 if not more, of the dates that are right next to those
10 signatures were exact duplicates of each of other. Is that
11 correct?

12 A Yes. Two of the dates were identical.

13 Q Okay. And the only way that identical dates could
14 be placed on those pages --

15 JUDGE STEINBERG: Don't lead.

16 MS. LANCASTER: I'm sorry.

17 BY MS. LANCASTER:

18 Q How would identical dates be put on different
19 pages?

20 A Cut and paste, transparency. Some way one was
21 photocopied onto the other.

22 Q They couldn't have been both written on there and
23 be identical. Is that correct?

24 A Not as identical as they are. No. They are
25 identical.

1 Q So you have at least portions of those three
2 documents where there is evidence that you have concluded
3 that they are not genuine, they weren't put on that document
4 originally. Do you understand my question?

5 A From inference -- I'm sorry.

6 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, we don't know both of them
7 were put on there. I think you have to sharpen your
8 question.

9 BY MS. LANCASTER:

10 Q For the dates that you say are exact duplicates,
11 could they both have been written on the two pages
12 originally?

13 A No.

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: You mean original writings?

15 BY MS. LANCASTER:

16 Q Original writings. Right. Is that evidence to
17 you that one date was placed, was copied or cut and pasted
18 or used by computer method or whatever other -- trace --

19 MR. ROMNEY: Objection. Leading.

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: Sustained.

21 BY MS. LANCASTER:

22 Q What does that imply to you?

23 A One or both of those dates was not original to the
24 document that it is on. If that makes sense.

25 Q And can you tell whether the signatures were

1 original to the document that they're on?

2 A No.

3 Q Would you normally be able to tell that?

4 JUDGE STEINBERG: On a photocopy.

5 BY MS. LANCASTER:

6 Q On a photocopy of this quality?

7 A Not of this quality. No.

8 Q As a matter of fact, is that why you prefer not to
9 examine photocopies?

10 A Yes. Because we don't know the origin of the
11 signature.

12 Q Okay. And these particular photocopies, would you
13 consider then good photocopies?

14 A No. Poor photocopies.

15 Q so based on the quality of the document, can you
16 tell if any of these signatures were traced?

17 A No.

18 Q Can you tell if any of these signatures were cut
19 and pasted?

20 A No.

21 Q Can you tell if they were put on there by any
22 other means other than having been originally written on the
23 pages?

24 A No.

25 Q And I believe you stated that as far as Q-4, Q-5,

1 Q-6, and Q-7, which are the Sumpters and Jennifer Hill's
2 signatures that were on the other original applications, are
3 you familiar with those?

4 A Yes.

5 Q That they are definitely not -- they were not
6 written by who they purport to be written by?

7 A Correct.

8 MS. LANCASTER: I have no further questions, Your
9 Honor.

10 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. ROMNEY:

12 Q Ms. Bolsover, did you receive the original
13 handwriting samples that were taken in this case by the
14 different deponents?

15 A The originals of the --

16 Q The handwriting samples that were done.

17 A Yes.

18 Q Do you recall examining the handwriting sample
19 give by Norma Sumpter of her own signature?

20 A I compared it with --

21 Q Do you have that in your documents, ma'am?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Would you pull that out, please, and have that in
24 front of you?

25 Do you have that in front of you, mx?

1 A Yes.

2 Q Would you demonstrate that to the Court? I don't
3 think that's been made an exhibit here. I just want to the
4 Court to have an opportunity to look at it.

5 Do you understand what that document is?

6 A It's about a hundred documents, actually.

7 Q Okay. Would you explain to us -- while the judge
8 is looking at that, would you explain what that is?

9 A Those are request handwriting specimens of Norma
10 Sumpter, her signature and there are some -- in the
11 beginning, I think --

12 JUDGE STEINBERG: You've got the forms in the
13 beginning.

14 THE WITNESS: Right. The forms in the beginning.
15 Right. You have the personal qualifications form and the
16 582s -- are the 582s in there? I'm not sure. Yes. This is
17 request handwriting of Norma Sumpter.

18 BY MR. ROMNEY:

19 Q And one of the documents that you have in that
20 pile of Norma's samples of handwriting is Norma Sumpter
21 signing her own signature. Is that correct?

22 A That is correct.

23 Q And she did that about 24, 25 times?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And you will also pursuant to Judge's Exhibit

1 No. 2, the January 29th letter, you received numerous
2 examples of what were purported to be genuine signatures of
3 Norma Sumpster? Is that correct?

4 A Correct.

5 Q Did you notice any difference, ma'am, between the
6 handwriting sample and the other exemplars of her
7 handwriting?

8 A Could I take a look?

9 Q Oh, yes. Take all the time you want.

10 (Pause.)

11 A As would be expected, they are little more free
12 flowing, a little more natural looking, which is why we like
13 to request normal course of business writing. When we get
14 request writing, the person writing -- doing this much
15 writing, 100 or so, 125 handwritings at one time, their
16 signature tends to get more deliberate.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: You said free flowing and
18 something else?

19 THE WITNESS: More natural.

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: And that would be on --

21 THE WITNESS: The normal course of business
22 writing.

23 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Not the samples that she
24 would have written at her deposition.

25 THE WITNESS: Right.

1 BY MR. ROMNEY:

2 Q Are you able to eliminate, ma'am, from Norma
3 Sumpter's handwriting sample any deceptive intent to hide or
4 disguise the handwriting on that handwriting sample?

5 A I didn't have any feeling that she was trying to
6 disguise her writing.

7 Q Was the signature on those handwriting samples
8 substantially different enough from the normal course of
9 handwriting samples that you had to support a conclusion
10 that it is impossible at least to eliminate deceptive intent
11 in giving that particular handwriting sample?

12 A I'm not sure what you just said, but I did not
13 have any feeling that she was trying to disguise or in any
14 way be deceptive with the handwriting sample that she gave.

15 Q You were not asked to review that for that?

16 A No. Under normal circumstances, when I got the
17 normal course, I made a comparison and it was -- it's close
18 enough that I didn't have any feeling she was trying to
19 disguise her writing.

20 Q Did you make any qualitative analysis between
21 Norma's handwriting sample of her own signature and
22 the normal course of business documents and anybody
23 else's normal signature in normal course of business
24 documents to determine whether or not Norma's sample
25 was more different than others? I don't know if you can

1 follow the question.

2 A I don't think her signature is that much
3 different. It's not that different. It is just a little
4 more deliberate because of -- probably of the amount -- this
5 is -- the amount of writing that she was doing. And also
6 being asked to sit and write something.

7 Q In preparing --

8 JUDGE STEINBERG: Is that a review -- the
9 comparison between the known documents, whatever you call
10 them, the normal course of business documents and the
11 handwriting sample, when you're doing your analysis, is that
12 something you normally take into account, the differences
13 that you described here today between somebody writing their
14 name a hundred times at one sitting versus normal course of
15 business? Do you understand that?

16 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is something.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: So it wouldn't be something that
18 you would be -- that would be unusual for you to do, to
19 consider.

20 THE WITNESS: No. I would always consider that.

21 BY MR. ROMNEY:

22 Q When you are given an assignment like this, this
23 particular case, do you do all the work yourself or do you
24 have an assistant that helps you in doing that?

25 A No, I do it all myself. It is reviewed by

1 somebody else. Someone else looks at it after I finish and
2 agrees with my opinion or it doesn't go out as it stands.

3 Q The work that you do, is it always for the federal
4 government?

5 A No, we work for state, local --

6 Q No, but I mean you work for government entities;
7 you don't work for private litigants?

8 A No.

9 Q So the only people that would retain your services
10 or use you as a witness would be on behalf of a government
11 entity?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Are you compensated for appearance at trials or is
14 that just part of your salary?

15 A Just part of my salary.

16 MR. ROMNEY: Thank you, Your Honor. No further
17 questions.

18 MR. PEDIGO: No further questions.

19 MS. LANCASTER: I have a few questions,
20 Your Honor.

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: Make them as narrow as possible,
22 please.

23 MS. LANCASTER: Okay.

24 JUDGE STEINBERG: Because we've got to move on.

25 MS. LANCASTER: Okay.

1 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MS. LANCASTER:

3 Q Ms. Bolsover, you heard Mr. Romney question you
4 about whether or not signatures and handwriting that you see
5 that would have been written in the normal course of
6 business is more indicative of a person's actual handwriting
7 than the handwriting that they would give you on a
8 handwriting sample, such as the one that he referenced with
9 Norma Sumpter. Do you recall that line of questioning?

10 A If that's what he was trying to say.

11 Q Did you not understand that to be what he was
12 trying to say?

13 JUDGE STEINBERG: I think she didn't understand
14 his testimony -- not testimony, my apologies. That was
15 maybe a Freudian slip and I do apologize.

16 BY MS. LANCASTER:

17 Q You had lots of documents from Norma Sumpter aside
18 from the handwriting sample that she gave in compliance with
19 the normal forms that they fill out for the Postal Service.
20 You had lots of other documents to use for her handwriting.
21 Is that correct?

22 A That's correct.

23 Q And you had lots of other documents to use for Jim
24 Sumpter, correct?

25 A Correct.

1 Q And Melissa Sumpter?

2 A Correct.

3 Q And Jennifer Hill?

4 A Yes.

5 Q They all provided documents -- as a matter of
6 fact, that were written back in the time period of 1995 to
7 1996 and we sent those to you for you to use those
8 documents, didn't we?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And, as a matter of fact, in the handwriting
11 samples that were all given pursuant to the normal Postal
12 Service criteria, the form, I'm talking about --

13 A Yes.

14 Q All the number of pages. They don't just write
15 their own name, do they? I mean, like Norma Sumpter doesn't
16 just sit down and write Norma Sumpter. Isn't that correct?

17 A On all the documents?

18 Q Repeatedly.

19 A No, she wrote a lot of different names.

20 Q Okay. And she wrote Jim Sumpter's name like 25
21 times, didn't she?

22 A Correct.

23 Q And she wrote Melissa Sumpter's name 25 times,
24 didn't she?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And she wrote Jennifer Hill's name 25 times. Is
2 that correct?

3 A Yes. That's correct.

4 Q And then she filled out the form with all the
5 different signatures that your form specifies that she was
6 to write. Is that correct?

7 A Yes. Mm-hmm.

8 JUDGE STEINBERG: That was a yes?

9 THE WITNESS: Yes.

10 BY MS. LANCASTER:

11 Q So based on all of the documents that you have
12 examined for the Sumpters, do you have any indication at all
13 that the Sumpters wrote their names on those original
14 handwriting applications? I believe you stated that you
15 didn't -- you considered all these other documents when you
16 reached that conclusion, didn't you?

17 MR. ROMNEY: Objection. Leading.

18 JUDGE STEINBERG: The objection is sustained, but
19 it's in the record like three times.

20 MS. LANCASTER: One other question.

21 BY MS. LANCASTER:

22 Q Did you receive any normal course of business --
23 you understand when I say normal course of business samples,
24 I'm talking about handwriting samples from people that are
25 outside of the Postal Service format that was also sent to

1 you? You understand that?

2 A Yes. I know that.

3 Q Did you receive any normal course of business
4 handwriting samples from Ronald Brasher?

5 A I don't know. I'd have to look.

6 Q Okay. Look. I'm going to ask you about Ronald
7 Brasher, Pat Brasher, David Brasher and Diane Brasher.

8 (Pause.)

9 A No. I didn't receive any normal course of
10 business writings from any of those people.

11 Q Okay. So the only thing that was provided to you
12 by them was the handwriting sample that the FCC requested
13 and used the Postal Service format for.

14 A Correct.

15 Q If you were looking at documents and trying to
16 compare signatures and it became apparent to you that
17 someone was trying to disguise their handwriting based upon
18 all the known samples of their handwriting that you have,
19 would I specifically -- in this case, would I specifically
20 have had to ask you about that for you to mention it?
21 Do you understand that question?

22 A No.

23 Q Okay. In the normal course of your examination of
24 a document, and you're comparing the questioned -- let's use
25 a signature in this example, the questioned signature with

1 signatures that you've received on all the known documents,
2 if you thought at any time that the person was trying to
3 disguise their handwriting, would you mention that?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Whoever has made the request wouldn't have to ask
6 you that specifically, would they?

7 A No, I would probably contact whoever submitted it
8 and say that this writing appears to be disguised and maybe
9 that you need to get some more.

10 JUDGE STEINBERG: Did you do that in this
11 examination for this case?

12 THE WITNESS: No.

13 BY MS. LANCASTER:

14 Q You're not receiving any extra money for coming
15 and testifying, are you?

16 A No.

17 Q And you didn't know anything about this case
18 before you examined these documents, did you?

19 A No.

20 Q You weren't told what to look for, were you?

21 A No.

22 MS. LANCASTER: I have no further questions.

23 FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. ROMNEY:

25 Q Judge's Exhibit No. 4, ma'am, do you have that in

1 front of you?

2 A Give me --

3 JUDGE STEINBERG: February 27.

4 MR. ROMNEY: February 27, 2001.

5 JUDGE STEINBERG: Where we changed the 9 to the
6 16.

7 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Okay.

8 BY MR. ROMNEY:

9 Q The next to the last paragraph, it says "There is
10 an allegation."

11 A Oh, yes. I was asked to look at that.

12 Q You were specifically asked to look at that issue,
13 right?

14 A Yes, I was.

15 Q Is there any question that you answered that
16 I asked you, ma'am, that you didn't understand?

17 A Just the one that I said I didn't understand when
18 you asked it.

19 Q And it was re-asked?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And you know as an expert testifying witness that
22 you always have the right to ask a question if you don't
23 understand it, correct?

24 A Right.

25 Q Did Ms. Lancaster ever give you any information

1 about whether she had asked for course of business
2 handwriting exemplars from Mr. Ronald Brasher?

3 A No.

4 Q How about from Patricia Brasher?

5 A No.

6 Q How about David Brasher?

7 A No.

8 Q How about Diane Brasher?

9 A No.

10 Q Do you understand that as an FCC representative or
11 Enforcement Bureau employee in this case that she has the
12 right and the duty and the opportunity to ask licensees of
13 the FCC who owe an official duty of candor --

14 MS. LANCASTER: Your Honor, this is --

15 MR. ROMNEY: -- to the FCC to cooperate in any
16 request that she might make of them for handwriting
17 examples?

18 THE WITNESS: I have no information about the FCC
19 at all.

20 BY MR. ROMNEY:

21 Q Okay. So you can't explain the lack of normal
22 course of business handwriting samples from those four
23 individuals that I have named, can you?

24 A No.

25 MR. ROMNEY: Thank you.

1 MR. PEDIGO: Your Honor, just one question.

2 FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. PEDIGO:

4 Q Ms. Bolsover, let me ask you this. Did you have
5 enough documents to support every opinion you provided to
6 us?

7 A Yes, I did.

8 MR. PEDIGO: No further questions.

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: You are excused. Thank you very
10 much. I assume that you are going to be sticking around for
11 a while?

12 MS. LANCASTER: Yes, Your Honor.

13 (The witness was excused.)

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: There is another document that
15 should be made an exhibit and that is the -- I think
16 everybody has it -- the first page is a fax transmittal to
17 Mr. Romney from Mr. Higgs? It's the report that
18 Ms. Lancaster circulated earlier.

19 MS. LANCASTER: Oh, the fax. Okay.

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes. The fax. Let's rip off
21 the first page because we don't need that and rip off the
22 last page, and then we will just identify the middle pages
23 and I get nine pages, a total of nine pages. And we'll call
24 it fax transmission to Michael Higgs, Esquire -- can't
25 forget the Esquire --

1 MR. HIGGS: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 JUDGE STEINBERG: Dated 2/21/01. That will be
3 identified as Judge's Exhibit 5. And this is where
4 the known documents are listed because it's not any other
5 place.

6 (The document referred to was
7 marked for identification as
8 Judge's Exhibit No. 5.)

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Does everybody have nine pages,
10 a total of nine? The first page says fax transmission and
11 the last page ends with Ms. Bolsover's signature.

12 Okay. Any objection to the receipt of Judge's
13 Exhibit 5?

14 MR. ROMNEY: No, sir.

15 JUDGE STEINBERG: Without objection, it is
16 received.

17 (The document referred to,
18 previously identified as
19 Judge's Exhibit No. 5, was
20 received in evidence.)

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. What's next?

22 MR. ROMNEY: We've got Julie Edison. I don't know
23 if there's an official resting of the government's case or
24 whatever --

25 JUDGE STEINBERG: No, there isn't.

1 MR. ROMNEY: Okay.

2 JUDGE STEINBERG: The way I made the schedule was
3 that we would have the two handwriting experts go back to
4 back and then we would break for lunch so that if there was
5 any additional handwriting testimony that that could be
6 worked on over lunch and then after lunch we would have PCIA
7 witness number two.

8 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: We won't be calling another
9 witness.

10 JUDGE STEINBERG: You won't be calling PCIA
11 witness number two?

12 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: No.

13 JUDGE STEINBERG: I would prefer to get all this
14 over before lunch so that people could think at lunchtime
15 about what they want to do this afternoon other than go
16 home.

17 If anybody has a problem with that or you want to
18 do it differently, I don't care.

19 MS. LANCASTER: Your Honor --

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: Let's go off the record.

21 (A brief recess was taken.)

22 JUDGE STEINBERG: We are on the record.

23 Before we went on the record, Mr. Romney asked to
24 have three exhibits identified.

25 The first one, which will be identified as RB/PB

1 Exhibit 12, is a four-page document entitled Communique
2 Document Examiners, Julie C. Edison. It's a qualifications
3 summary. And that is identified as RB/PB Exhibit 12.

4 (The document referred to was
5 marked for identification as
6 RB/PB Exhibit No. 12.)

7 JUDGE STEINBERG: The second document is a
8 five-page document on letterhead of Communique Document
9 Examiners and it is entitled Exhibits Questioned. That will
10 be identified as RB/PB Exhibit 13.

11 (The document referred to was
12 marked for identification as
13 RB/PB Exhibit No. 13.)

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: And the final document is --
15 How many pages is that?

16 MR. ROMNEY: Thirteen, Your Honor, I believe.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: A 13-page document and the pages
18 are marked Exhibit 1 through Exhibit 13 in Roman numerals,
19 so we'll just call it 13 pages of exhibits. And that will
20 be marked for identification as RB/PB Exhibit 14.

21 (The document referred to was
22 marked for identification as
23 RB/PB Exhibit No. 14.)

24 JUDGE STEINBERG: And now, Ms. Edison, if you
25 would stand and raise your right hand, please?